App. F. IX-4

1928-29
(Muz)

File No. 210-28

Serial Nos. 1 - 4

Previous References
69-27 Sls 1-4
24-25 .. - 2
490-13 1- 3
249-25 - 2

Later References 224-24 Sls 1-6
280-23 1. -
33-13 ,
69-27 Sls -5
W. 88-34-1
7-41-18, 1922

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. 1 - 4

Part B for Feb 29

SUBJECT

Additional insignias to Chowdadanapur muth
Ranebennur Taluk, Dharwar Dist.

To The Muz. Commr.
No 1667 d 21-2-29

States that Govt do not see any reason to sanction the additional honors claimed by the muth

28/3/29

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

( )

NOTES.

File No. 210/28

FILE HEADING.

Additional insignias to Chowdadanapur Mutha Ranebennur Taluk, Dharwar Dist.

FROM

From the Muzrai Commnr. in Mysore.

No.	Dated	Received
889	1/12/28	3/12/28.

Diary No.	Enclos.	Spare copies	Serial No.
827	One file		1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Recommends the grant of permission to use twelve insignias in addition to those already granted during the Swamy's tour within the State.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

The following Royal and special birudas were allowed to the mutt with G.O. d. 7th June 1926.

1. Makara thorana } Royal honors
2. Hagaldivatige }
3. Chamara Special honor
4. Sweta chattri (without Panchakalasa)
5. Kari nishani.
6. Danka on horse. Special honor

NOTES—First Sheet.

File No. 216 of 192

Serial No.

✓ On a further representation from the M.C. the following four insignias were also allowed to be used in G.O. of 30/3/28 in addition to the ordinary insignias.

1. Aflagiri — Royal honors
2. Bhoochakra kodey
3. Surya vadya } Special honors
4. i.e. Chandra vadya.

Vide the final note of Mr. [illegible] in this connection

3 The M.C. now recommends that the following 12 additional insignias may also be allowed to the Mutt.

	Class
1. Hanbale Nishani	Special
2. Simhalalata Palaki	do
3 Manchal	Royal
4 ~~Ahanpi~~ Dhangari Chatri	Special
5. Navapatta	Royal
6 Surapana	do
7. Chowri	Special
8 Red Chatri	do
9. Surya Prabha	not classified.
10 Chandra Prabha	
11 Nishani Kudare	
12. Panchrangi Chatri.	

The classification is according to the G.O. of 29th May 1926.

4 In recommending the grant of the above, the M.C. states that although the 3 5 & 6 are classed as Royal, yet they especially the manchal are in the enjoyment of many mutts & so also the special insignias with the exception of Simhalalata. There does not, according to him, much difference between chamara & chowri, the former of which the mutt is allowed.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No. of 192

Serial No.

to parade. Hanumbala nishani is said to be peculiar to Lingayet mutts & that Bhanga Chatri & Kempu ~~Chatty~~ Chattry are not of great importance.

5 As regards the non classified birudus, the M.C. states that Surya Prabha & Chandra Prabha were allowed to be exhibited by the [illegible] Swamy of [illegible] & [illegible] Kshatriya guru on the occasion of their visits to Mysore and that Nishani kudre & Pancharange Chatri are only ordinary appendages.

6 In view of the antiquity & importance of the, the [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ requests that he may be permitted to include these in the sanad already issued by him permitting the exhibition of the sanctioned antiquities

No. 3620

11/12/28. 7 (for Member)

13/12

8 Where is the statement referred to in para 4 of 'M.C.'s letter?' Please put up a list showing in juxtaposition the honours allowed to the chief Lingayet Mutts in the state and those claimed by this Mutt

15/12/28

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. of 192

Serial No.

9 The Statement refd to in para 4 of M. C's letter has not been received. A dft calling for the Statement together with a list showing the honors allowed to chief Lingayat Matts in the State, is submitted for appl.

10 The M. C has been issuing printed Rahadaries to matts in the State, and copies thereof are not received here.

AV
3-1-29

11 Done
MD
3/1/29

2 To, M. C. No 1309 d/ 8.1.29
Calls for the Statt refd to in the above letter together with a list showing in juxta position [illegible]

SUS

3 From, the M. C letter no 889 d/ 18.1
Submits a statement giving the required information. Opened & with H. P. The Statement (K) showing in juxtaposition the honors allowed to the chief Lingayat Matts in the State.

K.

K/L

Please put up the Statement directed

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Statement is put up.

827

5

and Revenue
Secretariat

File No 1090 / 26

App. F. III—2]
of 192 8

Serial
No.

and those claimed by this Mutt
Submitted with ref to member's
in para 8 of the office note

Statement I, shows the honours
given & now proposed for the Mutt
as compared with 3 Lingayat Mutts
(for Member)

AV
8-2-29
13

13/2

13/2

FED.
4918.

Of the 12 additional Honours applied for, the following are Royal Honours:—

(1) Morchal
(2) Nawa~pata
(3) Surepana.

Nos. (2) and (3) are not allowed to the Murgi Mutt. No. (1) is allowed to both the Bale Honnur and Murgi Mutts and it is desirable that there should be a distinction in favour of local Mutts.

The following are Special Honours:-

(1) Simhalalataaa Pallakki
(2) Bharjari Chatri
(3) Chowri.

No. (1) is not allowed either to the Bale Honnur Mutt or the Murgi Mutt. Nos. (2) and (3) are not allowed to the Murgi Mutt.

The following are Honours the exact character of which is not ascertainable:-

(1) Kambli Nishani
(2) Kempu Chatri

NOTE – Contn. sheet

Serial No.

(3) Surya Prabhe

(4) Chandra Prabhe

(5) Nishani on horse

(6) Five coloured Chatri.

These are more or less of the nature of Special Honours and of these No. (1) is not allowed to Murgi Mutt. No. (2) is however allowed to both the Balehonnur and Murgi Mutts: Nos (3), (4), (5) and (6) neither to the Balehonnur Mutt nor to the Murgi Mutt.

On a review of the whole position, it is seen that except in two cases the other Honours proposed for ~~to~~ this Mutt are those not allowed to local Lingayet Mutts of high reputation. In regard to the two ~~cases in~~ which they are allowed to ~~these~~ Balehonnur and Murgi Mutts I think it is desirable that they should enjoy a distinction not allowed to an outside Mutt~~s~~.

The Muzrai Commissioner may be informed that there are no reasons to allow the additional Honours applied for by this Mutt.

3443
16 2 29

16/2

16.2.29.

16/2

16/2

18/2

15/2

General and Revenue
Secretariat

Mer File No 210

App. F. III—2]
of 1928-29

Serial No.	
4	To. Mer. Comr No. [illegible] of States that Govt do not see any reason to sanction the arrl honours claimed by the [illegible] [illegible]

B
B
[illegible]
12/3

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 021—GPB—30,000—21-8-28

No. 889 [illegible] 7-8

FINANCIAL SECRETARIAT
1 DEC. 1928
No

Muzrai
OFFICE OF THE ~~REVENUE~~ COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE.

Bangalore, 29th November 28 192

1/12

SECR.

FROM

P. G. D'SOUZA, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai ~~Revenue~~ Commissioner in Mysore.

MUZRAI
D.No 827
Muz -2/10-28

To

P. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial Department.

3/12

SIR,

Adverting to Government Pro. No. 1781/M.F. 269-27-3 dated 30th March 1928 permitting the use of certain insignias by the Swamigalu of the Chowdadanapur Matha, I have the honour to state that a Rahadari embodying the insignias allowed in Government Order No. 1560-7/M.F. 34-25-2 dated 7th June 1926 and in the above proceedings and the other ordinary ones was issued in this office O.No.827, 27-28 dated 20-10-28 (Printed copies enclosed).

2. As the original list of insignias claimed by the President of of the Veerasaiva Association on behalf of the Swamigalu and sent to the Revenue Secretary to Government with letter D.No.385/24-25 dated 8th November 1924 was not forthcoming either in the Secretariat or in this office (vide your letter No.3858/M.F.269-27 dated 11th April 1928) the Secretary of the Association was requested to send a copy of the list attached to his application of the 3rd November 1924. The Secretary while stating that he was not in a position to say whether the original list was returned to the Association along with the voluminous records or not, submitted a copy from a rough draft said to have been retained with him and requested that a revised Rahadari including all the Birudus may be issued.

3. On a careful examination it was found that the list contains the marginally noted 12 insignias to which no reference was made in the previous [illegible]

1. [illegible] Special. | 5. [illegible] Royal. | 9. [illegible]
2. [illegible] -do- | 6. [illegible] -do- | 10 [illegible]
3. [illegible] Royal | 7. [illegible] Special | 11 [illegible]
4. [illegible] Special | 8. [illegible] - do | 12 [illegible]

Not classified:

and the Secretary of the Association was informed that as the use
to the Matha in the orders till now passed they cannot be included
these Pirums [illegible] ceeded in the Rahadari proposed to be issued without the [illegible] of Government. The Secretary while admitting that special recommendation may be made for the inclusion of the twelve Pirums, requested that a Rahadari including the honors so far granted may be issued to enable the Swamigalu to make a move to other parts of the State. A Rahadari was accordingly issued as stated in [illegible].

1. For the favour of [illegible] a statement showing the class under which each insignia falls according to the classification made in G.O. [illegible]/.F 24[illegible]-2 dated [illegible] 1926 and giving also the names of other [illegible] twelve [illegible] of the insignia is [illegible]. From the above analysis it will be seen that though [illegible] and [illegible] have been classed as Royal yet they are [illegible] [illegible] have been in the enjoyment of many Mathas. [illegible] special, except [illegible] [illegible] being paraded [illegible]. There does not seem to be much difference between [illegible] & [illegible], the former of which has been allowed [illegible]. [illegible] seems to be peculiar to Lingayat [illegible] [illegible] & [illegible] [illegible] insignia of great importance.

As [illegible], the use of [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] This [illegible] the occasion of his visit to Mysore [illegible] Government in their orders No.497-[illegible] F.190-[illegible]-2 dated 27-6-14 and 1040/ F.230-2[illegible]-2 dated 13-6-24 [illegible] constitutes [illegible] but నిశాని [illegible] and [illegible] seem to be [illegible] differences.

The antiquity [illegible] of the Matha and the eligibility of its present head to enjoy these high honors have been reported in sufficient detail in the recommendations made by my predecessors (Mr. A. Chandy and Mr. J.S. [illegible]) and also in my letter of the 28th January 1928. Although [illegible] 12 additional insignia [illegible] claimed are mentioned in the Secretary's letter of the 7th January [illegible], the recommendation made [illegible] "[illegible]" [illegible] those previously recommended and thus I beg to submit be considered as a disability to favourably view the ------- representation now urged. As many of the Royal and special insignias have already been conceded in favour of this Matha and as the Swamigalu is said to enjoy much higher honours (including ಅಡ್ಡಪಲಕಿ) in British India, I beg to recommend that permission to use the 12 insignias in - connection with the Swamy's tour within the state may be accorded.

6. The connected file of papers is enclosed for kind reference and return.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

lk

F G—1

CT.......

Section Muz

File No. 210-28

Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to..........

No. 1309 Precis File

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 192

To

The M. C.

Date of issue 8/1/29

Signed by

Sir,

Adverting to your letter no. 889 Dt 1-12-28 recommending additional Birudus to Chowdadanapura Matt in the Ranebennur Taluk, Dharwar Distt, I am directed to ~~report~~ state that the statement refd. to in para 4 of the above has not been received and to request that it Commr/ may be sent for reference together with a list showing in juxta position the honors allowed to the chief Lingayat Mathas

over

List of enclosures..........

Copied by..........

Examined by..........

in the State, and those claimed by this mall

(2) The encls. are retnd for ref & re submission

I have etc.

30/1/43

D(4) Int. Secretary

31/1/43

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 17th January 1929.

18

No. 889 Sy/File
27-8

FROM

P. G. D'Souza, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore

19
MUZRAI
D1090
Muz-210-28-3

TO

R. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial Department.

SIR,

Referring to your letter No.1309/Muz.210-28-2 dated 8th January 1929 re grant of certain additional insignias to the Chowdadanapur Matha in the Ranebennur Taluk, I have the honor to forward a statement giving the required information and to solicit the favour of early orders in the matter. 12

2. The enclosures are resubmitted.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

17/1/29
Assistant Commissioner
For Muzrai Commissioner.
(Absent from station.)

F G—1

SUBJECT....... ....

Section IVUy
File No. 210-28
Serial No. 4.

No. 1667

Diary No of letter replied to.. ....

General and Revenue Secretariat

(   )

the   192

Date of issue. [illegible]

Signed by ....

To

Me M. C.

Sir,

Adverting to correspondence ending with your letter no. 889 dt 18th January 1929 re the grant of additional ^hereditary^ honors to Chowdadanapura Matt in the Ranebennur Taluka, ^in connection with controversy within the Matt^ I am directed to state ^that^ on a review of the whole position, ~~that~~ ^the Govt do not see any^ ~~(There are no)~~ reason to allow the additional honors applied for by

over

List of enclosures ....

Copied by .. ..

Al

Examined by RS 25/2

WD 0399—GPB—20,000—18-9-28

This note which may be
informed accordingly.

(2) The enclos. are returned

I have etc

J. T. Sealy